

REMARKS

Claims 1-98 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 4-6, 24, 27-29, 44, 46, 54, 57-59, 76 and 79-81 over Schwerdtfeger in view of Chen

In the Office Action, claims 1, 4-6, 24, 27-29, 44, 46, 54, 57-59, 76 and 79-81 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,725,424 to Schwerdtfeger et al. ("Schwerdtfeger") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,668,354 to Chen et al. ("Chen"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1, 4-6, 24, 27-29, 44, 46, 54, 57-59, 76 and 79-81 recite a stylesheet comprising transformation information for manipulating content based on capabilities of a mobile device.

The Examiner acknowledged that Schwerdtfeger fails to disclose a generating and using a stylesheet containing transformation information indicating content to be extracted from a source page and transformed into a destination page (Office Action, page 2). Schwerdtfeger fails to even mention use of a stylesheet, however, the Office Action relies on Chen to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in Schwerdtfeger to arrive at the claimed features. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Chen discloses a graphical user interface tool that accepts user input to generate a display template for automatically generating a style sheet (col. 8, lines 50-53). Thus, the style sheet is based on what a user desires the style sheet to be viewed as. Chen fails to disclose a stylesheet comprising transformation information for manipulating content based on capabilities of a mobile device, as recited by claims 1, 4-6, 24, 27-29, 44, 46, 54, 57-59, 76 and 79-81.

Moreover, the Examiner alleges the motivation to modify Schwerdtfeger with the disclosure of Chen is "to have used the stylesheet generation of Chen to have implemented the transcoding taught by Schwerdtfeger so that the transcoding of the source to destination page could

have been automatically adaptable to the content contained in the source page". (Office Action, page 3).

Transcoding and stylesheet generation are two completely different processes for two completely different purposes. Thus, the Examiner's motivation to modify Schwerdtfeger with the disclosure of Chen to use the stylesheet generation to implement transcoding of a source to destination page that could have been automatically adaptable to the content contained in the source page is nonsensical.

Thus, Schwerdtfeger modified by Chen fails to disclose, teach or suggest transformation information for manipulating content based on capabilities of a mobile device, as recited by claims 1, 4-6, 24, 27-29, 44, 46, 54, 57-59, 76 and 79-81.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1, 4-6, 24, 27-29, 44, 46, 54, 57-59, 76 and 79-81 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, 7-23, 26, 30-43, 45, 47-53, 55, 56, 60-75, 77, 78 and 82-98 over Schwerdtfeger in view of Chen and Fong

In the Office Action, claims 2, 3, 7-19, 26, 30-41, 45, 47-50, 55, 56, 60-71, 77, 78 and 82-94 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Schwerdtfeger in view of Chen, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,279,015 to Fong et al. ("Fong"), with claims 20-23, 42, 43, 51-53, 72-75 and 95-98 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Schwerdtfeger in view of Fong. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 2, 3, 26, 45, 55, 56, 77 and 78 recite a stylesheet comprising transformation information for manipulating content based on capabilities of a mobile device.

As discussed above, Schwerdtfeger modified by the disclosure of Chen fails to disclose or suggest a stylesheet comprising transformation

information for manipulating content based on capabilities of a mobile device, as recited by claims 2, 3, 26, 45, 55, 56, 77 and 78.

The Office Action relies on Fong to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in Schwerdtfeger and Chen to arrive at the claimed features. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Fong is relied on to disclose displaying a plurality of content items on a graphical user interface, receiving a selection for an item of content, displaying any graphical components of the one item of content selected and generating a site mining expression for locating the one item of content in the source page, with the mining expression locating content in a document (Office Action, page 12).

Fong's invention is directed toward converting a document encoded in a markup language to another format that allows a user to interactively define mapping of SGML tags to another format (col. 2, lines 35-42). Fong fails to even mention data mining, a term of art, as part of the disclosed process, as alleged by the Examiner. Moreover, Fong invention is more closely related to Chen's disclosure of transcoding, NOT to use of a stylesheet. Fong fails to disclose or suggest use of a stylesheet, much less a stylesheet comprising transformation information for manipulating content based on capabilities of a mobile device, as recited by claims 2, 3, 26, 45, 55, 56, 77 and 78.

Thus, Schwerdtfeger modified by Chen and Fong fails to disclose, teach or suggest a stylesheet comprising transformation information for manipulating content based on capabilities of a mobile device, as recited by claims 2, 3, 26, 45, 55, 56, 77 and 78.

Claims 7-23, 30-43, 47-53, 60-75 and 82-98 respectively recite a stylesheet used for mining content from a source page to produce a destination page and a site mining expression for locating an item of content in a source page.

As discussed above, Fong fails to even mention data mining, as alleged by the Examiner. Moreover, Schwerdtfeger and Chen fail to disclose any type of data mining. Thus, Schwerdtfeger modified by Chen and Fong would still

fail to disclose a stylesheet used for mining content from a source page to produce a destination page and a site mining expression for locating an item of content in a source page, as respectively recited by claims 7-23, 30-43, 47-53, 60-75 and 82-98.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 2, 3, 7-23, 26, 30-43, 45, 47-53, 55, 56, 60-75, 77, 78 and 82-98 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC



William H. Bollman
Reg. No.: 36,457
Tel. (202) 261-1020
Fax. (202) 887-0336

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC
2000 M Street, NW 7TH Floor
Washington, DC 20036-3307
TEL. (202) 261-1020
FAX. (202) 887-0336

WHB/df